

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on November 1, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-5 and 25-26 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1-5 and 25; 2) added new claims 27-32; and 3) canceled claim 26. As such, claims 1-5, 25, and 27-32 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

Election/Restriction

In response to the election requirement under 35 U.S.C. §121 imposed by the Office Action, Applicants acknowledge the constructive election of claims 1-5, and 25-26, drawn to graphical user interface for a capture system, classified in 715, subclass 738; and withdrawal of claims 22-24 without prejudice.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 101 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of non-functional descriptive material. Applicants have amended claim 1-5 and 25 to be in method form, and thus the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Biebesheimer et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0107843 A1 (hereinafter "Biebesheimer").

Biebesheimer relates to a customer self service system that performs resource search and selection. In other words, a customer enters a query to search for relevant resources in a database. (See, e.g., Abstract). For example, a customer may query "plan a trip to Vermont in June" to search for resources available in a database. (See, e.g., Figure 3). More specifically, Biebesheimer

discloses a mechanism for classifying user contexts for facilitating a more focused search and improving the relevance of query results for such a system. (Paragraph 0002).

A user context, as defined by Biebesheimer, represents a predefined set of context attributes which are relevant to the search behavior/needs of a group of people. (Paragraph 0050). For example, in Figure 3, with respect to the “travel” domain and the exemplary search query stated above (“plan a trip to Vermont in June”), various user contexts may be available—“single mom w/ kids,” “swinging singles,” and “business traveler”—thus, helping to focus the search (Figure 3). The search may be further focused via various context attributes such as “mode of transportation”, “mode of housing”, or “food style.” Additionally, resource parameters—such as “include all major carriers”—help focus the query.

The system provides a three part iconic interface for visualizing and exploring the set of resources that the system has found to match the user’s initial query and related subject and context variables. (Paragraph 0027). Via these interface components 12, 22, 32, the user may (re-)define their query, preview some or all of the suggested resources or further reduce, and redisplay the response set to extract those with the best degree of fit with that user’s current needs. (Paragraph 0027).

Furthermore, the system stores the users’ prior queries, responses, and interactions with the system, with the intention of improving search results. For example, the system retains adjustments made to the user context, manipulations to the displayed results, and viewing results and selection behavior. (Paragraph 0045).

Claim 1:

Claim 1 as amended reads:

A method comprising:

presenting a graphical user interface (GUI) for a capture system, wherein the GUI comprises one or more views including:
a search editor view to enable parameters of a

search of tags of objects captured by the capture system to be defined, the capture system to intercept and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule;
and

a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.

First, Biebesheimer does not disclose “a search editor view to enable parameters of a search of tags of objects captured by the capture system to be defined, the capture system to intercept and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule”. Biebesheimer discloses a system that includes three GUIs. The first GUI is the Context Selection Workspace 13. (Paragraph 0063 and Figures 1-2 and 4). Here the user selects a context to search and creates an initial query. (Paragraph 0063). The user may then add more details to the query via Detail Specification Workspace 23 or immediately see the results of the query via the results display 32. (Paragraphs 0063-0065 and Figures 1-2 and 4-5). However, Biebesheimer does not describe that tags are searched. Moreover, Biebesheimer does not disclose a capture system to intercept and store network transmitted objects according to a capture rule. Biebesheimer simply describes how to narrow a query by contexts and learning from past queries.

Moreover, the Office Action states that the context vector, results viewing, and selection behavior constitute the capture rule. These, however, do not constitute a capture rule for intercepting and storing network transmitted objects; but rather constitute parameters used to focus a query of a resource database.

Second, Biebesheimer also does not disclose “a capture rule view to enable parameters of the capture rule to be defined.” The parameters discussed in paragraph cited in the Office Action are not parameters of a capture rule. They have nothing do with capturing and storing network transmitted objects. Rather, these parameters pertain to the search query performed on a resource database.

Therefore, Biebesheimer does not anticipate claim 1 for this reason as well, and thus Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 2-3:

Claims 2-3 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and thus include all limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-3 are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as for claim 1.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 has been cancelled and thus the rejection for claim 26 is moot.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer in view of Khan, U.S. 7,185,192, (hereinafter "Khan"), and also as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer in view of Microsoft Outlook 2000 © 1995-2000 (hereinafter "Outlook"). Furthermore, claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biebesheimer in view of Cook et al., U.S. 7,185,192, (hereinafter "Cook").

Claims 4-5:

Claims 4-5 ultimately depend from claim 1 and include all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, as discussed above, claims 4-5 are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 ultimately depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, as discussed above, claim 25 is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

New Claims 27-32

New claims 27-32 have been added and include similar limitations discussed in claims 1-5 and 25, respectively, and are thus in a condition for allowance for similar reasons as for claims 1-5 and 25.

In light of the comments above, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of all claims.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Ryan W. Elliott at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/2/08



Ryan W. Elliott
Reg. No.: 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300